

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/625,048	07/23/2003	Katherine Barabash	IL920030014US1	1091		
Stephen C. Kau	7590 05/25/200 Ifman,	EXAMINER				
Intellectual Pro	Intellectual Property Law Dept. IBM Corporation P.O. Box 218			SAEED, USMAAN		
-				PAPER NUMBER		
Yorktown Heig	hts, NY 10598		2166			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			05/25/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/625,048	BARABASH ET AL.	BARABASH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Usmaan Saeed	2166		

	Usmaan Saeed	2166					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 15 May 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeat (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of the appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	, will not be entered b	ecause				
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow); tter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); ducing or simplifying					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.15. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	illowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		II be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 8-15,20-23,38-42,44,46 and 48. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, by because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar	ut before or on the date of filing a N	otice of Appeal will no	ot be entered s necessary and				
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
10. [_] Other							
,							

Application No. 10/625,048

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The newly added claim limitations of: "at any time while performing concurrently and at any time concurrently with the operations" and deletion of limitations reciting "c) unmarking a marked card comprising any of said objects and d) objects on said marked card" found in the amended independent claims 12, 20, 42, 44, 46 and 48 changes the scope of the invention and raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The newly added claim limitations and deletion of limitations found in the amended independent claims 12, 20, 42, 44, 46 and 48 changes the scope of the invention and raises new issues that would require further consideration and/or search and the claim limitations of the finally rejected claims are still met by the Printezis et al. (NPL "A Generational Mostly-Concurrent Garbage Collector").

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER